| ٠        |   |
|----------|---|
|          | Cours Su  |
|          | COURT OF A DORALS STATE OF APPEALS  |
|          | Court Of Appeals STATE OF WASHING.  DIVISION TWO.  BY MASHING.  |
|          | 7.500   |
|          |   |
|          | Of The State Of Washington DEPUTY   |
|          |   |
|          | State Of Washington No. 48183-9-II  |
|          | Respondent.   |
|          | Statement Of  |
|          | V. Additional Grounds   |
|          | For Review  |
|          | Keith Adair Davis   |
|          | Appellant.  |
|          |   |
|          | I, Keith Adair Davis, Have Received   |
|          | The Opening Brief Prepared By My Attorney.  |
|          | Summerized Below Are The Additional Grounds   |
|          | For Review That Are Not Addressed In That Brief.  |
|          | I Understand The Court Will Review This Statement   |
|          | I Understand The Court Will Review This Statement Of Additional Grounds For Review When My Appeal Is Considered On The Merits.                                  |
|          | Is Considered On The Merits.  |
|          |   |
|          | Additional Ground 1   |
| 7        |   |
| $\dashv$ | Defendant Was Not Allowed In Timol Monner To Exercise   |
|          | His Constitutional Right For Salf-Ronvesphilition, Soveral  |
|          | 1. Defendant Was Not Allowed, In Timely Manner, To Exercise His Constitutional Rights For Self-Representation, Several Times, Pre-Trial Motions, Hearings, Etc. |
| 1        | 11100) 1 C 1 101 101 101 101 101 101 101 101 1  |
|          |   |

-)-

- a. Denia | Of Right To Self-Representation Is Perse Harmful. Harris v. State, 113 Nev. 799, 942, P.2d 151 (1997).
- b. Denia | Of Right To Self-Representation Under Supreme Court's Faretta Decision Is Prejudicial Per Se. Const. Amend v 1. People v. Sohrab (1997).
- c, I, Requested Om Several Occasions To Assert

  Constitutional Right To Defend Myself, Via., Pre-Trial

  Motions, And Motions Submitted By Assigned Counsel

  (Please See Attachments #\$ 1-20).
- d. A Defendants Assertation Of His Constitutional
  Right To Represent Himself Must Be Made In A
  Timely Manner Prior To The Day Of Trial, As I
  Did, On Three Seperate Occasions, As Well As,
  Several Motions Were Given To Assigned Counsel
  To Submit To The Court, As The Court Would Not
  Allow Me To Submit Any Motions.
- e. When A Court Has Granted A Defendants Request To Represent Himself, The Court Must, Also Grant A Reasonable Continuance In Order For The Defendant To "Prepare To Defend His Case, People v. Fulton (1979, Cal App) 155 Cal Rpt 327

| f. A Defendant Need Not Have The Skill And Experience   |
|---|
| Of A Lawyer In Order Competently And Intelligently  |
| To Choose Self-Representation; Rather, A Record   |
| That Affirmatively Shows That He Was Literate, Com-   |
| petent, And Understanding, And He Was Voluntarily   |
| Exercising His Informeded Free Will Sufficiently  |
| Exercising His Informeded Free Will Sufficiently Supports A Waiver Of The Right To Counsel, Statev. |
| Davalloo, 153 Conn. App. 419, 101 A. 3d 355 (2014),   |
|   |

g. The Test Governing A Defendant's Motion For Self-Representation Is Not Whether The Defendant Is Competent To Represent Himself Adequately, But Whether He Is Competent To Make The Decision To Represent Himself. Cleveland v. State, 87 So. 3d 813 (Fla. 1st DCA 2012). Wilson v. State (2013). State v. Jones (2011). Eaton v. State (2013).

## Additional Ground 2

2. Assigned Counsel's Performance Fell Below An Objective Standard Of Reasonableness.

a. Each And Every, Pre-Trial Hearing, Which Were Many, In The, 7-Month Period Prior To Trial, Assigned Counsel, Came To Court Unprepared.

-3-

- b. Assigned Counsel, Eventually, Revealed That He Was Not Honest And Forthright.
- C. Assigned Counsel, Would Ask Me To Draw Up A Motion, Which Were Many, And He Would File Them, However, He Would Not File Them. Only Attempt To Orally, Make The Request, At A Hearing.
- d. Assigned Counsel, Entered No Documents Into Evidence, No" Exibits Were Entered For Defense. Being That Trial Started The Same Day The Court Allowed Self-Representation, And No Continuance; I Was Not Allowed To Submit Anything. (Example: See Attachment 21).
- e. Absolutely, No Evidence, Nothing Was Submitted For Trial, From Assigned Counsel (See Attachments 22,23,24).
- f. Appointed Counsel Failed To Investigate, Failed To Obtain Evidence.
- g. Assigned Counse | Made Errors So Serious That
  He Was Not Functioning As The "Counse!" Guaranteed
  The Defendant By The Sixth Amendment.

- h. Assigned Counsel Actively Represented

  Conflicting Interest And The Conflicting

  Interest Adversely Affected His Performance,

  By Having An Over-Whelming Case-Load, Of

  Up To, 600 Clients, At Any Given Time.
- i. Counsels Function In Representation, A
  Criminal Defendant IsTo Assist Defendant,
  And Hence Counsel Owes Client Duty Of
  Loyalty, A Duty To Avoid Conflicts Of
  Interests.
- 3. Assigned Counsel Broke "Rules Of Professional Conduct," 1.4 Communication, 2.1 Advisor.
- 4. Assigned Counsel And I, Did Have And Continued To Have, A Complete Break down In Communication."
  - a. He Did Not Prepare Defendant's Defense, As To How They Had Discussed for Seven Months.

    Defendant Was Unaware, Until Day Of Trial, When There was Absolutely, No Defense, To Present To Defendant When The Trial Court, Finally Allowed Self Representation. No Exibits, No Nothing.

|     | b. Defendant And Assigned Counsel Discussed  |
|-----|--|
| ·   | "Diminished Capacity." At Time Of Alleged  |
|     | Crime He Prepared Norhing. (See Attachments  |
| ·.  | b. Defendant And Assigned Counsel Discussed "Diminished Capacity," At Time Of Alleged Crime. He Prepared Northing. (See Attachments 27, 28, 29, 30). |
|     |  |
|     | Additional Ground 3  |
| · . |  |
|     | 5. Assigned Counsel Submitted A Motion And<br>Decleration For Withdrawal. (Attachments 31,32).   |
|     | Decleration For Withdrawal. (Attachments 31,32).   |
|     |  |
|     | a. A Complete Breakdown Of Communication   |
|     | a. A Complete Breakdown Of Communication Is A Good And Sufficient Reason For Withdrawal.   |
|     |  |
|     | Additional Ground 4  |
|     |  |
|     | 6. Does The Defendent Actually Assault The Victim In The Second Degree? How?   |
|     | In The Second Degree? How!   |
|     |  |
|     | a. Defendant Was The One Punched In Head.  |
|     |  |
|     | b. Defendant Put On Record, That The FollowThrough   |
|     | OF The Victim's Punch, Is How The Broken Skin  |
|     | On His Wrist Happened, By Way Of Defendants Jagged   |
|     | Teeth, Not The Balls Of Broken, Salety Shattered,  |
|     | Automobile, Standard Windows.  |
|     |  |

-6-

| c. Officer's Testimony, In Regards To The One<br>Laceration, Admits, That I+Was "Safe" To<br>Assume the Glass Cut Him, The Victim.     |
|--|
| Laceration, Admits, That I+Was "Safe" To   |
| Assume The Glass Cut Him, The Victim.  |
| ·  |
| d. The Officer Speaks Of The "One" Laceration, In The "Plural" Sense, However, Their Is Only One Laceration, (See Attachment 34,35).   |
| In The "Plural" Sense, However, Their Is Only  |
| One Laceration, (See Attachment 34,35).  |
| <b>1</b>   |
|  |
| Additional Ground 4  |
|  |
| 7. Trial Court Erred, When Defendant Requested A"Mistrial," And Denied Request. (See Astach-   |
| A "Mistrial," And Denied Request. (See Astach-   |
| ments 36,37,38,39).  |
|  |
| 8. Trial Court Erred, By Not Allowing Defendant, Anytime To Prepare For Trial, And Knowing That His Assigned Counsel Had No Defense To |
| Apatime To Prepare For Trial And Knowing   |
| That His Assigned Counsel Had No Defense To  |
| Hand Over To Defendant for Self-Kepresentation.  |
| (Please See Attachment 19.).   |
|  |
| 11 11  |
|  |
| w v  |
|  |
|  |
| i 71   |

|     | 1.       |
|-----|----------|
| 1 1 | 4        |
| MAR | 116 Pm)a |
|     | usion    |

I Pray That The Court, Can See The "Injustice,"
Of This Conviction, Although The Defendant, Knows
Very Well, That He Broke, Not Just Someones Car
Window, But A World War II Vets Car Window.
And The World War II Vet, Punched The Defendant
In His Head. Rightfully So. But, There Was
No, Second Degree Assault, No Deadly Weapon,
Nor, Was There Any TypeOf, Attempted Theft
Of A Motor Vehicle. There Was, A, 48-Year Old
Man, Experimenting With "Crystal Methamphetimine,"
He Thought, Was Assisting Him With His Battle Of
Multiple Sclerosis, And Suffered, Aparently, A
Well Known Side Effect, Paranoid Schizophrenia,
Dillusional And Neurotic Psychosis.

Keith A. Davis#216001169 Respectfully Submitted, King County Jail 500-Fifth Avenue Keith Adair Davis Seattle, WA 98104

| 1  | JAIL STAFF: I can't take restraints off.             |
|----|--|
| 2  | THE DEFENDANT: I'm already in shackles in a          |
| 3  | wheelchair. I can't go anywhere.                     |
| 4  | JAIL STAFF: Mr. Davis, I'm not going to argue        |
| 5  | with you.  |
| 6  | THE DEFENDANT: I'm not trying to argue with          |
| 7  | you. I'm trying to read this document here. Can you  |
| 8  | at least take one of these off? How come you're the  |
| 9  | only officer in the world who puts two on?           |
| 10 | THE COURT: Mr. Davis, good afternoon to you.         |
| 11 | THE DEFENDANT: Good afternoon, Your Honor.           |
| 12 | THE COURT: This is Cause Number 15-1-526-3.          |
| 13 | Mr. Jefferson, good afternoon to you.                |
| 14 | MR. JEFFERSON: Good afternoon, Your Honor.           |
| 15 | THE COURT: Mr. Keith Adair Davis is before           |
| 16 | the court on his motion to represent himself. The    |
| 17 | court has reviewed the record and the file.          |
| 18 | Mr. Davis, the court did not receive any             |
| 19 | memorandum of authorities or brief from you. Did you |
| 20 | intend to file anything with the court?              |
| 21 | THE DEFENDANT: File concerning                       |
| 22 | THE COURT: Your motion, any law that you want        |
| 23 | to rely on.  |
| 24 | THE DEFENDANT: Well, basically, I'm just             |
| 25 | asking the court to exercise my constitutional right |

to represent myself in this matter.

THE COURT: Okay. And I have received your motion filed with the court May 27. I don't think it was dated by you. But apart from the motion that you filed, did you file anything else?

THE DEFENDANT: I didn't file anything else, but I wrote the second part to it.

THE COURT: Okay.

THE DEFENDANT: Basically, I'm exercising -I'm asking the court -- I'm motioning the court to
exercise my constitutional right to represent myself
in this matter pro se to release Mr. Lawrence

Jefferson, esquire, as follows. I have represented
myself previously and have done rather well.

Unfortunately, I have a 40-year criminal history.

It's -- at nine years old I was a runaway. Children
were picked up in juvenile facilities. Parents
called, et cetera, in the '70s. I have much
experience with the system, basically.

So I -- I'm a nonviolent individual. I detest violence. I have been charged with a violent crime merely because I have ten criminal points, all nonviolent, all VUCSA charges and my history.

The prosectorial misconduct norm is to super over charge people to get them to plead to a still even

over charge. Mr. Jefferson is already overworked with probably 100 clients or so. He's busy. I can handle this case myself, whereas Mr. Jefferson can focus on the cattle folks.

Mr. Jefferson has agreed, if the court permits, to be my standby counsel in this matter. His skills and efforts can be focussed on the many -- the many other than my -- than me. Okay. Although the law states I am innocent until proven guilty, it's actually I am seen as guilty and have to prove my innocence as we know. So no one knows better than I as my defense of the events that inspired -- or transpired.

I suffer with secondary progressive multiple sclerosis. I cannot afford to take any chances on being sent to prison with all of my diagnosed complications and dysfunctions, being that the prison systems are not able to facilitate my medical needs such as jails, either. Therefore, going to prison is really not an option. Prison is counterproductive for me, as well as a costly burden on the state. And why? Because of agreed. Debt creates credit; credit creates debt. I must -- I shall not allow myself to be wronged in this manner.

I do apologize to the court, County of Thurston, and my great State of Washington for my toxic-induced

1 insanity for this crime that I am being charged with. But in no way am I anywhere near guilty of assaulting 2 3 anyone, never have, never will. THE COURT: Mr. Adair, tell the court, meaning 4 5 me, what it is that you are charged with. 6 THE DEFENDANT: They charged me with a second 7 degree assault with a deadly weapon. 8 THE COURT: And what are the elements of that 9 crime? THE DEFENDANT: Well, the elements -- for one, 10 11 you have to assault someone. THE COURT: And what is an assault? 12 THE DEFENDANT: Well, you have to physically 13 14 put your hands on someone. THE COURT: 15 Okay. THE DEFENDANT: And physically hurt them. 16 THE COURT: What are the other elements? 17 THE DEFENDANT: Um, I'd have to really 18 19 research and get on with the other elements. I don't know them just by thinking about them. I'd have to 20 21 research a little bit to give them to you verbatim. 22 THE COURT: What else are you charged with? THE DEFENDANT: A deadly weapon. 23 24 THE COURT: Okay, Is there another crime that you're charged with? 25

| 1  | THE DEFENDANT: The other crime, malicious           |
|----|---|
| 2  | mischief.   |
| 3  | THE COURT: And tell me what the elements of         |
| 4  | that crime are.                                     |
| 5  | THE DEFENDANT: Well, being malicious. I             |
| 6  | mean, it could be breaking a window, doing          |
| 7  | something it's a property crime.                    |
| 8  | THE COURT: Okay. What are the elements of           |
| 9  | malicious mischief in the third degree?             |
| 10 | THE DEFENDANT: I don't know off the top of my       |
| 11 | head. Again, I'd have to look that up. But I could  |
| 12 | tell you by looking that up.                        |
| 13 | THE COURT: And what are the maximum penalties       |
| 14 | by law for both of those crimes?                    |
| 15 | THE DEFENDANT: I'm looking at 68 months or          |
| 16 | something of that nature.                           |
| 17 | THE COURT: What are the maximum penalties           |
| 18 | anyone could receive for those two crimes?          |
| 19 | THE DEFENDANT: Probably probably ten                |
| 20 | years. I think being that it's a Class B felony,    |
| 21 | you're talking about ten years, because I have ten  |
| 22 | points.   |
| 23 | THE COURT: Okay. And what is the maximum            |
| 24 | penalty for malicious mischief in the third degree? |
| 25 | THE DEFENDANT: I believe it's a year.               |
|    |   |

THE COURT: Okay.

THE DEFENDANT: But the -- anyway, my point -- my point is, I've been overcharged. I didn't assault anyone. And there was no -- there was no -- there was no weapon. So it was just an overcharge as the prosecutor -- as prosecutions do.

THE COURT: Have you ever represented vourself?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Tell me about that.

THE DEFENDANT: Well, I won.

THE COURT: Tell me when it was, where it was, and what the charges were.

THE DEFENDANT: King County. It was a-- first it came out to be a kidnapping, which was crap. And then it turned out to be a tampering with a witness. And that was crap. So, I mean, it all turned out to be where it was -- it ended up being a mistrial, and they came with a deal after nine months, and of course I signed, because I was tired of sitting in jail.

THE COURT: How long ago was that?

THE DEFENDANT: 2009.

THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Davis, I mean no disrespect, but are you currently or have you ever

| 1  | taken any medications for any mental illness?     |
|----|---|
| 2  | THE DEFENDANT: No.                                |
| 3  | THE COURT: Are you currently taking any           |
| 4  | medications?                                      |
| 5  | THE DEFENDANT: For multiple sclerosis, yes.       |
| 6  | THE COURT: And besides the instance that you      |
| 7  | just advised me about, the instance where you     |
| 8  | represented yourself, have you been to trial?     |
| 9  | THE DEFENDANT: Yes.                               |
| 10 | THE COURT: Tell me what your experience is in     |
| 11 | picking a jury.                                   |
| 12 | THE DEFENDANT: My experience? I don't I           |
| 13 | don't follow what you're asking.                  |
| 14 | THE COURT: How do you pick a jury?                |
| 15 | THE DEFENDANT: Well, I'll ask them questions      |
| 16 | and see if we are on the same if we could come to |
| 17 | the same — I don't know — understandings about    |
| 18 | things.   |
| 19 | THE COURT: Tell me more about the mechanics,      |
| 20 | the logistics of picking a jury.                  |
| 21 | THE DEFENDANT: The mechanics? Man, I need a       |
| 22 | dictionary with you.                              |
| 23 | THE COURT: Okay. Tell me how it is that you       |
| 24 | go about picking a jury.                          |
| 25 | THE DEFENDANT: Well, eye contact. Eye             |

I'm going to ask questions to see if we can 2 relate on certain things.

.1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: How many jurors in Superior Court in a felony trial?

THE DEFENDANT: I believe I get to pick six and he picks -- and the prosecution picks six.

THE COURT: And tell me how that works, how it is that you pick six.

THE DEFENDANT: Well, it's a -- you're going to get a whole bunch of people, and I get to go through one or two and then the prosecution gets to go through one or two. And then we say, well, we don't want that one or he don't want that one. it's kind of a pick-and-choose situation, say I ain't gonna pick this one, he might not want that one and he'll strike that one --

THE COURT: Okay. Can you --

THE DEFENDANT: -- and it kind of works like that.

THE COURT: -- can you give me any more detailed information about that process?

THE DEFENDANT: Well, I mean, I'll ask questions, and they'll ask questions, and we just kind of go from there. It's more of a feeling type of thing. That's how I do it. I mean, I'm going to

Colloguy Between the Court and the Defendant

ask questions pertaining to -- I'm not going to bring up the crime, but I'm going to bring up certain situations.

I mean, I might ask a juror, Are you an out-of-the-box thinker. And if they don't understand what that is, I'll try to explain what out-of-the-box thinking means.

THE COURT: Do you talk to potential jurors individually or all together? Tell me how that works.

THE DEFENDANT: I do it kind of the same.

I'll talk to some of them individually, and then I'll take statements from all. So I kind of gather them all together. I mean, I try to keep it -- I'm not trying to -- I don't try to make it into a big fiasco, because I'm really trying to get to the point and get out of there.

THE COURT: What's your level of education?

THE DEFENDANT: 70,000 degrees. No, I'm kidding. No, I have a -- I have some college.

THE COURT: Tell me about your college.

THE DEFENDANT: Well, I took my GED at 15. I went to work. And when I worked for Boeing, I went to Green River College to further educate myself.

After Boeing, I went and did construction and further

educated myself in the construction field.

THE COURT: Are you familiar with the rules of evidence?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I am.

THE COURT: Tell me about that.

THE DEFENDANT: The rules of evidence. Well, there's certain rules that have to be met in order to become evidence. Is that what you mean?

THE COURT: Tell me as much detail as you can about the rules of evidence.

THE DEFENDANT: As much detail as I can about the rules of evidence. Okay. The rules of evidence, it has to -- the rules of evidence. First off, it's got to be pertaining to the crime. The evidence has to meet the crime. I mean, you can't just make things up and say this is going to convict this person or you can use this evidence as a rule. You can't just -- you can't just make things up. It has -- there's guidelines. That's the best way I can explain them to you.

THE COURT: How many rules are there?

THE DEFENDANT: It depends. I'm sure there's quite a few.

THE COURT: Are you familiar with the rules of court?

THE DEFENDANT: Well, yes. 1 THE COURT: Tell me about that. 2 THE DEFENDANT: Well, there's certain 3 quidelines. There's certain -- there's certain 4 steps. Everything has an order and a procedure. 5 mean, when you -- I don't have the books in front of 6 7 me. I don't represent myself every -- I'm not a lawyer. But when I can research and look and read, I 8 9 don't have a problem. I don't have a problem with 10 comprehending. I'm not a lawyer, though, no. So I don't know off the top of my head. I don't have a 11 12 bar -- I didn't take the bar exam. THE COURT: Do you know how to issue 13 14 subpoenas? THE DEFENDANT: How to issue subpoenas? Yeah. 15 I would write something up saying that I want him to 16 17 show to court. I need him to come to court. All of these things are in the Westlaw and Lexis and Nexis 18 19 to guide you through. I know that much. That's how 20 I've been doing it. The times I have represented 21 myself, I used the computer system. 22 THE COURT: Okay. And how do you -- what are 23 the rules for conducting cross-examination of the 24 State's witnesses?

THE DEFENDANT: I would have to read up on

1 I don't know that verbatim. I'm already those. 2 doing 89 trillion things every nanosecond to try and 3 function with multiple sclerosis. In order for me to 4 try to memorize the law, I don't see it happening. 5 If I could get the left side of my brain to function 6 and maybe another 10 percent of my right side, 7 possibly. 8 THE COURT: What defenses might be available 9 to you? 10 THE DEFENDANT: "Defenses"? Meaning? Would 11 you elaborate? THE COURT: What legal defenses might be 12 available to you charged with these crimes? 13 14 THE DEFENDANT: Well, first off, I didn't assault anyone. My legal defenses would be is that 15 the man was on one side of the car --16 17 MR. JEFFERSON: Don't say anything about the --18 19 THE DEFENDANT: Oh. But I'm trying to answer 20 the question. 21 THE COURT: Okay. So what you're telling me is that one of your defenses would be a denial; that 22 23 you simply deny that it happened. 24 THE DEFENDANT: Well, for one I can deny that

it happened. It happened in broad daylight.

| 1  | THE COURT: Okay.                                 |
|----|--|
| 2  | THE DEFENDANT: And I'm not stupid                |
| 3  | MR. JEFFERSON: Stop.                             |
| 4  | THE DEFENDANT: All right.                        |
| 5  | THE COURT: That's all I need to know. Thank      |
| 6  | you.   |
| 7  | THE DEFENDANT: I freaked out.                    |
| 8  | MR. JEFFERSON: Don't comment because anything    |
| 9  | that you say here can be used against you.       |
| 10 | THE DEFENDANT: That's fine.                      |
| 11 | MR. JEFFERSON: so                                |
| 12 | THE DEFENDANT: everybody needs to                |
| 13 | MR. JEFFERSON: stop. I need you to stop          |
| 14 | when I ask you to stop.                          |
| 15 | THE DEFENDANT: All right.                        |
| 16 | THE COURT: Have you ever prepared jury           |
| 17 | instructions?                                    |
| 18 | THE DEFENDANT: Yes.                              |
| 19 | THE COURT: Tell me about that.                   |
| 20 | THE DEFENDANT: It was a while ago. But           |
| 21 | wow. Did I prepare instructions? All I know is I |
| 22 | interviewed the jurors. I remember that.         |
| 23 | THE COURT: Tell me                               |
| 24 | THE DEFENDANT: And I picked a pretty good        |
| 25 | jury.  |

1 THE COURT: Tell me about -- are you familiar 2 with jury instructions? 3 THE DEFENDANT: Oh, yeah. They're going to 4 have a certain guideline for certain crimes. 5 they have to follow those guidelines. I know that 6 much. 7 THE COURT: Okay. Tell me what jury instructions are. 8 THE DEFENDANT: Well, jury instructions would 9 10 have to instruct -- it's what the -- the instructions 11 for the jury are to go by. 12 13

THE COURT: Okay. And how is the jury instructed?

THE DEFENDANT: By law.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Do you know how to prepare proposed jury instructions?

THE DEFENDANT: Well, if I don't know off the top of my head, I can figure it out.

THE COURT: Tell me how a trial works after a jury is picked.

THE DEFENDANT: Well, after a jury is picked. they're going to sit back, and they're going to -they're going to look at the elements of the crime. First off, they're going to see does this person meet the elements of the crime. Then they're going to go

over the elements of the crime. And then they're going to figure out if this person's guilty or not guilty. They're going to sit back and talk about it.

THE COURT: How is the evidence presented to the jury?

THE DEFENDANT: How is it presented to them?

Oh, well, you've got your prosecution and then you're going to have your defense. They're going to give you each part of their -- their evidence. And then it's up to the jury to decide you've got -- you've got -- you've got one side of a story, another side of the story, and then you've got the truth. Their job is to figure out what the truth is.

THE COURT: And tell me how evidence is presented to the jury, in what form?

THE DEFENDANT: Well, there's several forms.

It's going to be -- it's going to be presented to them in black and white, on paper. It's going to be presented to them through the people that are being held accountable or being charged with these crimes. The prosecution, your attorneys. That's how.

THE COURT: And you said something about black and white --

THE DEFENDANT: Paper.

THE COURT: -- on paper. Tell me about that.

How is that evidence presented to a jury?

THE DEFENDANT: Well, it's given -- it's given to them on a printout.

THE COURT: Give me an example of that.

THE DEFENDANT: Well, right here. Evidence.

I mean, it's not necessarily good evidence or it might not even be proper evidence, but they've got to read through it and decipher to see if it is proper evidence or it can be.

THE COURT: And give me an example of what written evidence might be presented to a jury.

THE DEFENDANT: Oh, well, a police report. A police report is evidence. Video surveillance is evidence. I don't know if they use criminal history. But criminal history should be evidence. Beings that I don't have any assaults on my record, I'm going to bring my own. Out of 40 years of not having any assaults, I don't think I have a record of assaulting people. I don't have that pattern.

THE COURT: So are you telling me that if you were representing yourself, it would be your intention to advise the jury of your criminal history?

THE DEFENDANT: If necessary. I -- I don't think -- I don't know if I would need to. I'm

saying -- my point is this: If I need to, I'll pull that rabbit out of a hat, because I know that witnesses — what do you call them? — expert witnesses will show you a person with a 40-year history, within their first ten years, they're going to show a pattern of violence. And then they're not going to take 40 years to become a violent person. So I know good and well, even though I was under the influence of drugs --

MR. JEFFERSON: Stop.

THE COURT: Tell me about collateral consequences of a conviction. Does that make sense to you? Have you heard that term before?

THE DEFENDANT: Collateral --

THE COURT: Collateral consequences of conviction. What happens to you in addition -- or what might happen to you if you are convicted?

THE DEFENDANT: What might happen? All kinds of things can happen to me if I'm convicted. I don't know how -- I don't know what you -- I don't follow you.

THE COURT: What legally might happen to you in the event you are convicted of a crime?

THE DEFENDANT: Legally?

THE COURT: Yes.

Colloguy Between the Court and the Defendant

1 THE DEFENDANT: I could go to prison. 2 THE COURT: Anything else? 3 THE DEFENDANT: Well, I'd become a hell of a 4 burden to the state. 5 THE COURT: Do you have any legal training? THE DEFENDANT: Well, I represent myself. I 6 7 stay in the law libraries when I do go to prison. I quess I could be somewhat of a semi-paralegal. 8 9 That's what I do. I hang out in the law libraries. That's what I do when I do time. 10 THE COURT: Do you have any formal legal 11 12 training? 13 THE DEFENDANT: Well, the best you can get in 14 prison and correspondences in places like Lawyers Guild in New York, places in Oakland, California, 15 16 people who are trying to stop the modern day he who slave prisons initiative act. 17 THE COURT: Do you know how to challenge a 18 19 juror? 20 THE DEFENDANT: Challenge a juror. Could you expand on that, "challenge a juror"? 21 THE COURT: Do you know how to challenge a 22 23 juror? THE DEFENDANT: I don't understand your 24 25 meaning behind "challenge."

THE COURT: Have you ever heard that 1 term, "challenge a juror"? 2 THE DEFENDANT: Legally, no. I need a law --3 4 a Black's Law Dictionary so that I could answer that 5 correctly. Because to challenge someone means to - I don't know - get in their face somehow, so to speak. 6 7 So to challenge a juror -- I don't know. Do you 8 like -- how could that work? I mean how would I 9 approach a juror? Are you a juror? Are you sane? 10 Are you a racist, or do you hate criminals? I don't know what you mean. I'd have to look that up and 11 12 decipher that one to figure out what you're talking 13 about. THE COURT: What constitutional rights do you 14 have with respect to an attorney and representing 15 16 yourself? 17 THE DEFENDANT: What Constitutional rights do I have. Say it again, please. 18 THE COURT: What Constitutional rights do you 19 20 have and everyone else have with respect to a right to an attorney and a right to represent himself or 21 22 herself? 23 THE DEFENDANT: What Constitutional rights do 24 I have -- of an attorney, you said?

THE COURT: Yes.

THE DEFENDANT: Well, I should be represented by -- I should have the -- I'm supposed to have the opportunity to be represented by an attorney. But I don't need that. I'm fully aware of how to go through the motions of this. I've been doing it for 40 years. It's not nothing new to me.

THE COURT: Okay. And you've said now on three separate occasions that you're familiar with how to go through the motions. Give me as much detail as you can with respect to the motions that you go through to represent yourself.

THE DEFENDANT: Follow protocol.

THE COURT: Tell me about the protocol.

THE DEFENDANT: Step by step.

THE COURT: Tell me about the steps.

THE DEFENDANT: Arraignment, omnibus, pretrial, trial.

THE COURT: Tell me about the steps at trial.

THE DEFENDANT: Pick a jury. Jury selection. Then I present proving my innocence, and then I -- you know, we go battle -- we go -- me and the prosecution will go head to head on our issues. We'll battle our issues.

They'll come up with their issues, and I'll de-but (sic) them. I'll come up with mine, and they'll

1 de-but (sic) mine, and they will go off and back and forth like that until it's done. The jury will 2 decide. 3 4 THE COURT: You've said in general terms that you go back and forth. Tell me how that's done. 5 THE DEFENDANT: "Back and forth" meaning? 6 THE COURT: I'm asking you. You said you go 7 8 back and forth with the prosecutor. THE DEFENDANT: Oh, well, we will have 9 questions, he'll have questions, you'll have answers, 10 you'll have statements, and that's what I mean. 11 THE COURT: 12 Okav. 13 THE DEFENDANT: That's all. THE COURT: Mr. Jefferson, do you wish to be 14 15 heard on this issue? 16 MR. JEFFERSON: Your Honor, what I'd like the court to know is that Mr. Davis let me know very 17 18 early on that he wanted to be interested in 19 representing himself. And in every meeting that we 20 had he made that an issue. Basically I asked him to 21 put something in writing. When he did so, I made 22 that available to the court. He seems pretty 23 forthright in that he wants to represent himself. THE COURT: Thank you. 24 25 Mr. Thompson, does the State propose any

additional questions for the court to ask of Mr. Davis?

MR. THOMPSON: Your Honor has covered a number of areas. He has referenced his past criminal history. Perhaps further colloquy could go into what of those would be admissible and not admissible.

THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Davis, with respect to your criminal history, what convictions would be admissible against you and what of those convictions might not be admissible against you at a trial?

THE DEFENDANT: Hmm. You can bring them all up to the forefront, because I don't have any violent history.

THE COURT: From a legal perspective, what might the prosecutor -- what convictions do you have that the prosecutor might be able to introduce against you?

THE DEFENDANT: Nothing. I don't think so. I mean, he might have something that says this or says that, but that's still not a -- that's not a conviction. I mean, I've had problems with King County Jail. I've had problems with, you know, officers socked me in the jaw and claimed that I assaulted him. But, I mean, that's just how it goes.

THE COURT: Okay, Thank you.

Mr. Thompson, any other proposed questions that the State might have?

MR. THOMPSON: Your Honor, at this point, no.

I think there's a sufficient record.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Davis; anything else you'd like to tell me?

THE DEFENDANT: Well, I'd like for you -- I would like to -- Mr. Jefferson said he would be my standby counsel. I would -- I would appreciate that. I know I'm going to have to put in a motion for an investigator and also for -- what you call them witnesses? What are they called? I can't think of the word right now. I lose words sometimes. Like a doctor. They would be a -- expert witnesses. I'm going to need a couple of expert witnesses.

Other than that, that's about it, other than to notify the court or Thurston County Jail that I am pro se, so they can start whatever process with what limited resources they're going to allow me to have. And I need to start working on my case so we can get it out of here so I can get back to King County and deal with my other cases.

THE COURT: And you referenced expert witnesses. Why might expert testimony assist you in your defense?

1 THE DEFENDANT: Well, for one, I have multiple 2 sclerosis. And -- dealing with my brain, my brain 3 Most -- you know, for the most part. I'm 4 under the influence of --5 MR. JEFFERSON: Hold up. THE COURT: Tell me, what's the issue with 6 7 respect to your brain stem? THE DEFENDANT: Well, it's your brain. 8 9 don't know. They -- and neurologists don't know. 10 But I know when I start to hallucinate and see things under other influences --11 MR. JEFFERSON: Hold on --12 THE DEFENDANT: -- like -- like drugs --13 14 MR. JEFFERSON: -- hold it. Stop, stop. 15 THE COURT: Okay. I'll ask you to stop there. Do you have any history of mental illness? 16 THE DEFENDANT: No. But when I use a 17 18 substance --19 MR. JEFFERSON: Hold on. THE DEFENDANT: All right. All right. 20 21 THE COURT: And you referenced Mr. Jefferson 22 as standby counsel. What does that -- tell me what 23 that means to you. 24 THE DEFENDANT: That just means if he's able

to say, okay, don't go left, go right, I should go

right. He's not going to do the case for me. What he could do is kind of, okay, that's the wrong approach; you must think about that differently. Stuff like that. He'd give me hints. That's what I understand about standby. They're not going to do the -- nobody's going to do this case for me but me, and I don't want nobody to. I understand that.

THE COURT: Tell me about your constitutional rights. What constitutional rights do you have and do all of us have here in the courtroom -- for that matter, all of us here in the community? What are our constitutional rights if we are charged with a

THE DEFENDANT: Well, one of our constitutional rights is the right to exercise -- is to represent ourselves in a case law, to be heard.

THE COURT: What are the other constitutional

THE DEFENDANT: I don't know. I'd have to get my list and go over them. Remembering things, ADHD is not one of my best things. I have to have a book in front of me and read them. That's just one of my issues. I'm one of those ADHD to the 25th power. I forget to go to the bathroom.

> THE COURT: Okay.

20

21

22

23

24

Anything further you'd like to tell me?

THE DEFENDANT: Well, I'd like to hurry up and get this case on the road and get it done with.

THE COURT: And Mr. Thompson, the court understands that this matter is scheduled for trial the week of the 22nd of June, as I understand it.

Today is the 8th of June, so it is set for two weeks. Is that accurate?

MR. JEFFERSON: Right, Your Honor.

THE DEFENDANT: It works for me.

THE COURT: Okay. The court is ready to rule.

Mr. Davis, the court has conducted what it believes to be the appropriate and in fact even a lengthy colloquy with you regarding the issues the court needs to consider on the ultimate issue of whether to grant your motion to waive counsel and represent yourself. The court understands and appreciates an individual's right to represent himself or herself. That is a constitutional right, of course.

The court has to find that any such waiver is made knowingly and intelligently. With respect to whether a waiver is made intentionally, is anyone threatening you to give up your right to be represented by a lawyer?

THE DEFENDANT: No.

2

THE COURT: Are you under any duress

3

whatsoever?

4

THE DEFENDANT: No.

5

THE COURT: Okay. The court finds that

6

Mr. Davis has shown to the court that is voluntarily waiving his right to counsel, but the court believes

7

that Mr. Davis is not making any proposed or

8

proffered waiver intelligently and knowingly based

10

upon the colloquy that the court has had with

The court means no disrespect to Mr. Davis

11

Mr. Davis.

12

whatsoever. The court appreciates Mr. Davis's desire

1314

to represent himself. But it is clear, based upon

reviewing of the record and the file, at least the

15

5 the record to this court and from the court's

1617

electronic version of this file, that Mr. Davis lacks

18

the necessary skills or knowledge to represent

19

himself, not withstanding the possibility that he

20

represented himself on a prior occasion in

21 22

Mr. Davis has not provided the court with any

23

detailed information with respect to how to conduct a

24

trial, beginning at how to pick a jury. There is no evidence in the record, despite the court's colloquy

25

Oral Ruling of the Court

King County.

with Mr. Davis, regarding how witnesses are examined, in what order they are examined, how it is done, how testimony -- or, excuse me, other exhibits are offered into evidence, no reference to opening statements, closing statements, how to conduct proper examination. Mr. Davis has no experience with respect to offering or drafting proposed jury instructions. And in fact, Mr. Davis doesn't seem to understand what jury instructions are.

It is this court's opinion, very strong opinion, that Mr. Davis would be doing himself a disfavor by representing himself based upon his lack of the requirements --

THE DEFENDANT: I disagree.

THE COURT: -- that would be placed upon him, including being familiar with the rules of evidence and the rules of court and how to conduct a trial.

So based upon those findings, the court will deny Mr. Davis' motion to represent himself. And the next court appearance, I believe, is confirmation on the 17th.

Thank you.

MR. THOMPSON: Thank you, Your Honor.

(Conclusion of June 29, 2015, Proceedings.)

| 1  | THE COURT: I'm not in a position today,               |
|----|---|
| 2  | because I haven't been provided with                  |
| 3  | THE DEFENDANT: Were you provided with                 |
| 4  | THE COURT: It looks to me as if you have at           |
| 5  | least five different legal-size folders full of       |
| 6  | papers. They look to me to be about four inches       |
| 7  | high.   |
| 8  | THE DEFENDANT: Most of them right there it's          |
| 9  | only seven pages long, and it's handwritten.          |
| 10 | THE COURT: I haven't had an opportunity to            |
| 11 | review it.  |
| 12 | THE DEFENDANT: I have a lawyer right here to          |
| 13 | give it to you.                                       |
| 14 | THE COURT: Mr. Jefferson, the Court is not            |
| 15 | going to grant the request for the furlough on the    |
| 16 | record that's in front of the Court.                  |
| 17 | THE DEFENDANT: I need that motion done.               |
| 18 | THE COURT: Mr. Davis, I didn't interrupt you,         |
| 19 | and I don't want you to interrupt me. I'm not going   |
| 20 | to grant  |
| 21 | THE DEFENDANT: I have been interrupted since          |
| 22 | I was arrested.                                       |
| 23 | THE COURT: the motion today for the                   |
| 24 | furlough. With respect to the request from            |
| 25 | Mr. Jefferson on Mr. Davis' behalf to proceed pro se, |

| 1   | based on what I'm observing today, I'm not            |
|-----|---|
| 2   | comfortable granting that request.                    |
| 3   | THE DEFENDANT: I will just put another motion         |
| 4   | in for it. It doesn't matter.                         |
| 5   | THE COURT: Mr. Davis, what are the charges            |
| 6   | against you? Do you know what they are?               |
| 7   | THE DEFENDANT: The charges against me?                |
| 8   | THE COURT: Yes, sir.                                  |
| 9   | THE DEFENDANT: Second degree assault and              |
| 10  | malicious mischief with a deadly weapon and malicious |
| 11  | mischief, which is outrageous.                        |
| 12  | THE COURT: Do you know what the standard              |
| 1,3 | range is?   |
| 14  | THE DEFENDANT: 68 months to 70-something              |
| 15  | months.   |
| 16  | THE COURT: Have you ever represented                  |
| 17  | yourself?   |
| 18  | THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I have two cases right            |
| 19  | now in King County Superior Court.                    |
| 20  | THE COURT: Mr. Davis, you don't need to yell          |
| 21  | at me.  |
| 22  | THE DEFENDANT: I am not. I just have a                |
| 23  | migraine. It's kind of difficult to I just got        |
| 24  | out of a cold. With this compromised immune system,   |
| 25  | colds really affect me and anger I manifest my        |

| 1  | anger to grasp stimulation, chemically, electrically, |
|----|---|
| 2  | anatomically, and everything else and also            |
| 3  | stimulation and pain relief, anyway, sorry.           |
| 4  | THE COURT: All right. Are you ready to go to          |
| 5  | trial?  |
| 6  | THE DEFENDANT: Yes.                                   |
| 7  | THE COURT: And what have you done to prepare          |
| 8  | for trial?  |
| 9  | THE DEFENDANT: Well, currently, I haven't             |
| 10 | much to be done, because I'm not pro se to use of     |
| 11 | limited supply of their database. I haven't had the   |
| 12 | opportunity to hire expert witnesses on my behalf.    |
| 13 | My 3.5, I haven't had a chance to write that. I       |
| 14 | haven't had a chance to do anything but be harassed,  |
| 15 | abused, and neglected in a county jail that doesn't   |
| 16 | even have a medical system.                           |
| 17 | THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Mr. Davis.           |
| 18 | Mr. Jefferson, anything?                              |
| 19 | MR. JEFFERSON: Your Honor, if I could                 |
| 20 | supplement the record on a couple of issues?          |
| 21 | THE COURT: Briefly.                                   |
| 22 | MR. JEFFERSON: Number one, in February of             |
| 23 | this year on two cases, he was allowed to proceed pro |
| 24 | se in King County on other matters.                   |

THE COURT: And what happened in those cases?

11

MR. JEFFERSON: Your Honor, this case happened. There are currently bench warrants outstanding on those cases.

THE DEFENDANT: And why is that?

MR. JEFFERSON: The other thing in this case, we entered a Consolidated Omnibus Order on this matter. No 3.5 hearing was set: The information that I see in the file contains that there were no custodial statements made in this case. In addition, the defense has hired an investigator. Not all of the interviews have been completed yet.

THE COURT: Thank you. Mr. Wheeler, go ahead.

MR. WHEELER: We don't normally take a position on this issue, and I'm not at this point, but I would, for the Court's information, direct the Court to June 8th in which Judge Dixon already had a pro se colloquy with this defendant and denied the motion at that time. So I would ask the Court to consider whether or not this issue is collaterally estopped.

THE DEFENDANT: Oh, my God. He asked me questions that you ask at a bar exam, but if I had the printouts, I could answer them, and I am prepared for that. So we can go over Mr. Dixon's colloquy again, and I bet you I have the answers to them.

| 1                    | CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER   |
|----------------------|---|
| 2                    | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·                                   |
| 3                    | STATE OF WASHINGTON )   |
|                      | , '   |
| 4                    | COUNTY OF THURSTON )'   |
| 5                    |   |
| 6                    | I, SONYA L. WILCOX, RDR, Official Reporter                              |
| 7                    | of the Superior Court of the State of Washington in and                 |
| 8                    | for the County of Thurston hereby certify:                              |
| 9                    | <ol> <li>I reported the proceedings stenographically;</li> </ol>        |
| 10                   | 2. This transcript is a true and correct record of                      |
| 11                   | the proceedings to the best of my ability, except for any               |
| 12                   | changes made by the trial judge reviewing the transcript;               |
| 13                   | 3. I am in no way related to or employed by any                         |
| 14                   | party in this matter, nor any counsel in the matter; and                |
| 1.5                  | 4. I have no financial interest in the litigation.                      |
| 16                   | Dated this day, January 28, 2016.                                       |
| 17                   | ; · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·                                 |
| 18                   |   |
| 19                   |   |
| 20                   |   |
| 21                   | Souce hillox  |
| 22                   | SONYA L. WILCOX, RDR  |
| 23                   | Official Court Reporter<br>Certificate No. 2112                         |
| 24                   |   |
| 20<br>21<br>22<br>23 | SONYA L. WILCOX, RDR<br>Official Court Reporter<br>Certificate No. 2112 |

THE COURT: Judge Dixon I was not aware 1 already addressed this issue. I can tell you today, 2 3 Mr. Davis, based on my observations of your demeanor and my discussions with you in court today, I'm not 4 prepared to find that this would be an intelligent 5 waiver on your part or a knowing waiver, although 6 7 certainly it appears to be what you wish. I am going to deny the request today. I think that Judge Dixon 8 has already addressed it. In any event, I wouldn't 9 have been prepared to grant the request today on the 10 11 record in front of me. MR. JEFFERSON: Yes, your Honor. 12 13 THE COURT: Thank you. We are going to take a 14 recess that was the last matter on the 10 o'clock 15 calendar. I will be a back at 10:30. Thank you.

(A recess was taken at 10:15 a.m.)

19

24

16

17

18

20

21

22

23

21

22

23

24

25

Information. You have submitted the first amended 2 Information. If your case law is something that's accurate, and I have no reason to doubt that it is, I will evaluate it prior to this matter being submitted to the 5 jury. MS. ZHOU: That's fine, Your Honor. The only other thing I wanted to add was for count two, the State just 7 simply amended the language a little when going over the 8 WPICs jury instructions on Friday. The State realized 9 10 after a gross misdemeanor in count two, the State has to allege that the damage was over \$50 but under \$750 when the 11 initial original Information just said under \$750. 12 THE COURT: All right. Mr. Jefferson. 13 14 MR. JEFFERSON: No objection. THE COURT: All right. So that language I will read. 15 16 Anything else, Ms. Zhou? MS. ZHOU: Not from the State. 17 THE COURT: All right. Mr. Jefferson. 18 MR. JEFFERSON: Sorry, Your Honor. One moment. 19 Your Honor, in the trial brief that I submitted one of the 20

issues -- well, I see two major issues for this morning. The number one issue is that on numerous occasions Mr. Davis, starting officially on May 27th, 2015, has indicated that he would like to represent himself. That is still his intention. And so I think there -- the Court may want to go through a colloquy with Mr. Davis about that. And the major points is that skill or any of that is not required, just a willingness to have made the request timely, which he has done on three different occasions, as I've put in my brief, and that -- and that he's making this request unequivocally, that he's making it knowingly and intelligently knowing what the consequences of the actions -- of his actions are and knowing the charge, those types of things, and so I don't think that the former members of the Court who heard his request made the right rulings in this matter. Because he wants to proceed pro se. He's already representing himself pro se in two matters in King County.

The second issue is the issue of restraints. The defense is objecting to my client wearing any restraints. He's in a wheelchair. Really can't go anywhere. The only thing that he can do is use his elbows or something, and that's me. So those are the two major issues that I see.

THE COURT: All right. Well, let's take the issue of pro se representation first. This is a decision that has been previously heard by Judge Dixon who has made a decision in that regard, but it has been remade.

Mr. Davis.

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Let hear from you. Do you want to --

THE COURT: Mr. Davis, I feel like I need to tell you you won't have time to do that. Trial starts this morning.

THE DEFENDANT: That's fine.

THE COURT: This trial will not take seven days. I don't believe it will. I'm going to turn Ms. Zhou and ask her about that, but this trial is only a matter of a few days. You will not have time to do this reading that you say that you are willing to do to learn what you need to learn. You won't have time. That's -- I'm very concerned about that in terms of the -- again, the downside consequences of you representing yourself. To the extent you don't know anything now, you won't have time to learn it. And Mr. Jefferson brings to the table all of that knowledge right now.

The other thing you've mentioned about Mr. Jefferson, I appreciate your concern with his case load. I have observed Mr. Jefferson in trial, known him for a number of years. My expectation based on that experience is Mr. Jefferson will give you one hundred percent of his attention during this trial. His attention will not be divided as you might suspect, as you might believe it has been thus far. Does that in any way make your request equivocal?

THE DEFENDANT: Actually, no. I still remain -- I



still remain. I still stand on pro se.

THE COURT: Mr. Jefferson, you've been waiting to speak for a while.

MR. JEFFERSON: Your Honor, I just wanted to point out that on three different occasions he's filed documents with the Court, on May 2th, 2015, on July 8th, 2015, and July 21st, 2015. He also filed a document on August 25th, 2015. It was entitled "Motions: Immediate injunctions for serious medical needs." Of note he signed the document listing himself as pro se. I can say without divulging any confidential secrets that the first day that I met him he was considering going pro se in this matter. That was on April 23rd, and then by May 27th he filed the first motion.

The other issue is that there are no technical requirements. Mr. Davis is competent, and because of that he can make the decision about whether he wants to proceed or not. There's no basis of knowledge that is needed, only that he timely file the motions before the Court and that he go through a colloquy with the Court.

THE COURT: Ms. Zhou, anything from you on this issue?

MS. ZHOU: No, Your Honor, except that it was already heard in front of Judge Dixon and was denied.

THE COURT: I'm familiar with that.

So Mr. Jefferson.

. 24

MR. JEFFERSON: I'm sorry, Your Honor. Just about the ruling that Judge Dixon made was really about the technical issues.

THE COURT: Thank you.

MR. JEFFERSON: And not about the desire.

THE COURT: I read the  $\mbox{--}$  I read the colloquy and I read his decision.

MR. JEFFERSON: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: So State versus Madsen is a case that informs the Court on this issue. This is 168 Wn.2d 496, a 2010 decision from our Supreme Court. In that case the trial judge was confronted with multiple requests for prose representation. The Court in that — the trial court in that case denied it, reserved on the first few requests, denied it ultimately, denied it for reasons that the Supreme Court ultimately found reversible. The Court says — starts by saying every reasonable presumption is against the defendant's waiver of his or her counsel. And I've said that here this morning. The court goes on to say a defendant requesting pro se status — when a defendant requests it, "the trial court must determine whether the request is unequivocal and timely."

Now, a first-time request on morning of trial would not be timely, and I think there's ample case law to suggest that this court would be entitled to deny the request if it

was made for the first time on the first day of trial.

This has -- the court file makes it clear this request is not made for the first time today.

The court goes on to say in response to the trial court's rationale in the denial of the requesting in that case -- the Supreme Court goes on to say that "A court may not deny a motion for self-representation based on grounds that self-representation would be detrimental to the defendant's ability to present his case" --

THE DEFENDANT: I got that right here.

THE COURT: -- "or concerns that courtroom proceedings will be less efficient and orderly than if the defendant were represented by counsel."

There is no question in my mind that Judge Dixon was spot on when he made the decision that Mr. Davis representing himself is a bad decision for Mr. Davis. The colloquy that Judge Dixon had demonstrates to him and to me that Mr. Davis is ill prepared to represent himself.

Nevertheless, our Supreme Court has decided that a defendant has the right to make a poor decision. That decision also makes it clear, however, that the Court retains power, even if pro se status is granted, to withdraw that status if it becomes unworkable, if it becomes clear that the privilege -- or the right I should say, not a privilege -- the right is being abused.

THE COURT: Okay. So let me -- because we are 1 nearing the end of the State's case, let's get closure on 2 the point of amending this Information. 3 Mr. Jefferson, you're standing? MR. JEFFERSON: Your Honor, there is an issue with how the impeachment might occur, but we can discuss that --THE COURT: Let's do that now. MR. JEFFERSON: Your Honor, Mr. Kirkpatrick gave a 8 9 taped statement. I have access to the statement on my computer. I don't have a separate thumb drive for it or a 10 disk to be able to admit it as an exhibit so that may be a 11 problem. I also don't have a way to play it with any 12 degree of certainty at a specific moment in time. So it 13 doesn't -- the program that I have does not give me a --14 THE COURT: Has this not been reduced to a 15 16 transcript? MR. JEFFERSON: It has not: 17 THE COURT: So how are you expecting the procedure 18 of the impeachment to occur? 19 20 MR. JEFFERSON: I would expect that a question would be asked. If the person agrees with the statement, there's 21 22 no reason to do impeachment. If the statement -- if the person says "I didn't say that," then that -- that would be 23 24 the only extrinsic evidence and you'd have to play it. THE COURT: In which case we would not have it in 25

will take our own mid-morning break.

Ms. Zhou, what I expect to do when I come back is make a ruling on your motion to amend. To the extent that Mr. Davis has any further argument to add in that regard, because I recall we took a break in the course of his discussion with standby counsel on that issue, I'll have you respond to that, Ms. Zhou, make the ruling, we'll complete this witness, and then I'll -- with that decision on amending the Information being made, I guess I expect you to rest at that point, and then we'll make a decision with respect to the rest of our schedule for today --

MS. ZHOU: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: -- prior to bringing the jury back in.

I don't particularly want the jury back in and out and in and out here this morning. So that's what I expect to do.

We will be back at 20 minutes to eleven. Until then we will be in recess.

(A recess was taken.)

2.0

(Jury out.)

THE COURT: Please be seated.

Mr. Davis, have you had an opportunity to consult with your standby counsel regarding the potential impeachment of the witness?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

1.5

There's nothing to be produced positive. So it doesn't make any sense.

Let's see here. Like I said, I'm not -- I'm not stupid.

I've got a long history, a criminal history, nonviolent

crimes, a drug history.

MS. ZHOU: Your Honor, I'm going to object.

THE DEFENDANT: Why?

MS. ZHOU: It's not in evidence.

THE COURT: I will sustain that objection. The jury will disregard any statements made about Mr. Davis's criminal history. That has not been made evidence in this case.

THE DEFENDANT: I haven't had time to submit any evidence. That's fine. And apparently in six months neither did my attorney, but that's fine too.

Let's see. How I would word this? Because these are one of the checks and balances I've been talking about across the board that's going on in our nation, period.

These imbalances. Like I spoke of the ratio of incarceration, ratio issue, but it just exists, and this is public information that prisons and institutions are imbalanced with minorities. And these are the reasons a —this is some of the reasons why this is. You know, 14 percent of the state, 50 percent of them are incarcerated.

That's — I mean, why is that is my point. What is that?

How is that? How is that and why aren't we fixing it? I'm just making a statement.

Ladies and gentlemen, I suffer with multiple sclerosis secondary progressive. This means I have a lot of abnormalities, conditions and functions, et cetera, dizziness, vertigo, confusion, balance issues, date problems. Means I can't walk very well at times. Come a long way. Disorientation, pressure release issues, ongoing migraine, progressive, increases with pain levels, atrophied muscle spasms, severe, chronic and acute pains, pressure release issues, vagus system, digestive system disfunction, vagus system. The neurologists tell me that my optic nerve is damaged, which it probably is.

Anyway, this is what I deal with. I've come a long way. I've decided not to lay down and die. I stand up and live and work with it. People look at me and act as though I don't have anything. I'm healthy. I deal with this at the jail. They've assaulted me --

MS. ZHOU: Objection, Your Honor. It's not in evidence.

THE DEFENDANT: You're right.

THE COURT: I'm going to sustain the objection.

Ladies and gentlemen, please disregard the statements made

by the --

THE DEFENDANT: Which statements, Your Honor?

1.8

Okay.

Let's see. I touched on that. So I can't talk about the disease, right? My condition. (Attorney-client conversation.) Well, I don't really know how it affected me on that day. I just know it affects you. I had a nervous breakdown is what my mother would call it. Everything that I'm writing in my closing, which I haven't had time to prepare for, I can't really say. Other than her witness is a little overenthusiastic and contradicted his self on quite a few things.

I never mentioned stealing any cars. I never mentioned taking any cars. All I said, and I do remember what I did say, is sparkling, shining, bright and new. And that's something I say to traffic. That's -- to me that's rent-a-cars. That means there were people from out of town or other people following you.

And yes, I have been getting paranoid schizophrenic.

Other than that, I don't know what else to say because she's going to object and the judge is going to go along with it because what she states, he states. Larry,

Mr. Jefferson, he hasn't had time to do anything I've asked him to do in the last six months --

THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, you will disregard these statements from Mr. Davis.

THE DEFENDANT: That's it. I'm done.

I have to counter it, and I got lucky. I'm going to touch on that one.

Now, where was I?

There's a balance to everything. So it's a super stimulant, but the balance is it's highly toxic. I learned by people that I started hanging around with that used this drug, I'm going a little nuts, and well, you know, from overindulging in it, and I taught myself that moderation, you know, I have to be careful because people were starting to talk to their self and see things and hear things. And I noticed that. So I didn't use much of it. But I did use it daily. And I became dependent on it. But it's -- like I said, it has its -- it's a super stimulant, but it's highly toxic. Always a balance of something. Einstein was a genius, but he was insane, my point as far as the balance

MS. ZHOU: Your Honor, it's closing argument.

THE DEFENDANT: I'm closing.

 $\,$  MS. ZHOU: And Mr. Davis is again reciting facts that are not in evidence.

THE DEFENDANT: I'm reciting facts? Okay.

THE COURT: I'm going to sustain the objection.

Mr. Davis, please constrain your arguments to the allegations in this case and the facts that have been admitted.

Ralph H. Beswick, CCR (360) 786-5568

THE DEFENDANT: Okay. We know the State's right.

ļ, , .

| 1    | THE COURT: I'm going to give you one more            |
|------|--|
| 2    | warning to refrain yourself from speaking out in the |
| 3    | courtroom at this time. I'm trying to schedule a     |
| 4    | hearing. Nobody can be heard if you're speaking over |
| 5    | everybody.   |
| 6    | THE DEFENDANT: Well, I haven't been heard in         |
| 7    | five months. I haven't been represented in five      |
| 8    | months.  |
| 9    | THE COURT: Mr. Davis, I'm going to have you          |
| 10   | be removed if you don't stop.                        |
| 11   | THE DEFENDANT: Thank you. I don't care.              |
| 12   | THE COURT: In Mr. Davis' case I'm going to           |
| 13   | direct Ms. Zhou and Mr. Jefferson to go see court    |
| 14   | administration to set a special hearing for Mr.      |
| 15   | Davis' case as soon as possible.                     |
| 16   | THE DEFENDANT: The man is not representing           |
| 17   | me.  |
| 18 . | (Proceedings were concluded.)                        |
| 19   |  |
| 20   |  |
| 21   |  |
| 22   |  |
| 23   |  |
| 24   | ,  |
| 25   |  |

MOTION HEARING

| 1  | CERTIFICATE   |
|----|---|
| 2  | STATE OF WASHINGTON ) ) ss                                |
| 3  | COUNTY OF THURSTON )                                      |
| 4  | I, Cheri L. Davidson, Official Court Reporter, in         |
| 5  | and for the State of Washington, residing at Olympia, do  |
| 6  | hereby certify:   |
| 7  | That the annexed and foregoing Verbatim Report of         |
| 8  | Proceedings was reported by me and reduced to typewriting |
| 9  | by computer-aided transcription;                          |
| 10 | That said transcript is a full, true, and correct         |
| 11 | transcript of the proceedings heard before Judge Anne     |
| 12 | Hirsch on the 3rd day of September, 2015 at Thurston      |
| 13 | County Superior Court, Olympia, Washington;               |
| 14 | That I am not a relative or employee of counsel           |
| 15 | or to either of the parties herein or otherwise           |
| 16 | interested in said proceedings.                           |
| 17 | WITNESS MY HAND THIS day of,                              |
| 18 | 2015.   |
| 19 |   |
| 20 | Official Court Reporter                                   |
| 21 |   |
| 22 | *   |
| 23 |   |
| 24 |   |
| 25 |   |
|    |   |

CERTIFICATE

Mr. Jefferson representing, but we are going to continue, and that means that you will have an opportunity to provide your case very soon, and I think — and I'm going to turn to Ms. Zhou here in a moment and ask her the expected duration of her case, but my expectation is we're going to find you presenting your case today, and that means that if you are representing yourself, you will be held to the same rules and standards of any other litigant when it comes to presenting your case, and you may find yourself without the evidence and the tools that you wish you had if Mr. Jefferson was representing you. So again, I return to my plea to you to reconsider your decision to represent yourself.

THE DEFENDANT: Okay. Here's the thing. It's obvious I'm not prepared. I just was allowed *pro se* today after six months. I'll reenter that.

THE COURT: That was yesterday.

THE DEFENDANT: Well, I'm just saying. I haven't been allowed to prepare. No time. But that's okay. Whatever. My thing is this: Expert witnesses, I already mentioned that to this man, but he's been 60, 75,000 people case load a week. You know, I need expert witnesses on my condition. I need expert witnesses on the drugs that I was on. You know, I need character witnesses on my case because I'm not with violence. I didn't -- this is a

peculiar -- this is a very ugly case to me because that's a 91-year-old man for one. I respect my elders. Where I come from -- I don't know if you know where Lake Washington is. It's where I was raised. My father was a city official. Like I said, I have morals, ethics, values, principles and standards. I was raised this way. But the thing is, I don't go around assaulting people. But I'm about law and order, and I say checks and balances, if you go without checking them, they become imbalances, and that's a problem across the board. I've been saying that the whole time the last couple of years. You don't know where I've been and what I've been going through. But certainly things are going to have to be done in order for me to win this case because there's another thing I need to put into -- as an exhibit.

Ms. Zhou is not going to give me a deal because I have nine points. So she's basing her case on my prior history of drug charges. So it's not about me assaulting this man; it's about my prior history of drug -- of drug convictions. And you know, that's just ugly. You know, and that's what we do. But it's okay though, but I'm not going for it.

But what am I to do? Just go ahead and lay down? I don't lay down. If I want -- if I did that, I'd just die with this condition I have. But all that being said, you know, what do I do with

2.0

this? You want me to go ahead and allow this man who has had no time -- you know, no disrespect. Being that he's had 85,000 clients per week, how can he have time for my case just right at the day of trial? I notice this is how you guys do things.

But this case here, it looks ugly. You know, I mean, it looks like I'm some predator and attack the elderly, and I can't -- I can't sit -- I don't sit well with that because I don't have no history of that. It don't even compute.

My father's turning over his in his grave. I wasn't raised that way. He built a Masonic temple. He knows governors. Ron Sims used to come to the house. I know city councilmen and mayors, and come on. It's just -- I can't -- I can't do it. I don't get it.

How can you -- that's why I'm putting it on record. How can you not allow me any time -- I mean no time. We can continue on with trial, but I need some type of time. I don't know care if it's a day in that law library or whatever they got over there to prepare some kind of way. I mean, I'm going to go as I can because I'm going to let my ADHD work for me today, but please don't take it wrong or I'm not trying to be disrespectful. I'm very verbally aggressive, but I'm not disrespectful until I'm disrespected. But, you know, a few times I'm real passive. But Your Honor, this is ridiculous. But --

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Davis --1 THE DEFENDANT: I mean, come on. 2 3

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2,1

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: I'm going to cut you off here.

THE DEFENDANT: Go for it.,

THE COURT: I'm going to characterize your request as a request for some sort of delay, but we are not to your case yet so we'll cross that bridge when we get to it.

In the meantime, Ms. Zhou, what is your expectation as to the duration of the rest of your case?

MS. ZHOU: Your Honor, if all goes according to plan, the State anticipates resting this morning.

THE COURT: So Ms. Zhou, let's take up your motion to amend the Information. You filed a brief yesterday regarding the amendment of the Information. You have added the request to add a separate prong of RCW 9A.36.021 into your information for count one. Do you want to make any further presentation apart from what's in your brief?

MS. ZHOU: No, Your Honor. I think my brief was sufficient.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Davis, there's been a motion by the State to amend the Information. If you recall, your counsel, while he was still representing you, objected to this. We are now taking up the matter, and more formally after I received what I requested to be a written submission from the State on this issue. What is

- A. His upper torso was more on top of him.
- Q. And from your observations from your view -- the vantage point

  of -- where were you when you made all those observations?
- A. I was standing right by where you would enter the driver's seat.
  - Q. Okay. So you weren't in the car yourself.
- 7 A. I leaned into the car to pull him out.
- Q. When you made the observations as to what the defendant was doing, were you leaning into the car or were you just standing by the driver's side door area?
  - A. Well, I was leaning into the car when I was hearing the elderly gentleman say "Help."
  - Q. Okay. And when you saw that, you indicated that you saw the defendant was somewhat on top of the elderly gentleman, did you see where the elderly gentleman's head was?
- 16 A. Not particularly.
- 17 Q. Okay. No further questions.

THE COURT: Thank you, Ms. Zhou.

Mr. Davis.

20

23

24

11

12

13

14

15

21 RECROSS-EXAMINATION

22 BY MR. DAVIS:

- Q. So you didn't see me until basically when you heard the window break.
- 25 A. No. I saw you before outside of the Oyster House. You kicked

- over a couple of cones, and then you just were mumbling to 1 2 yourself kind of just slurring your words, and then I saw you 3. go in the parking lot of Bayview, and that's when I just waited for my bus. 4
  - So you were watching me prior to this incident.

5

- Well, I didn't want to get into conflict with you before so I 6 kind of kept my distance. 7
- Well, that's a good thing because I was pretty much out of my 8 9 mind.
- MS. ZHOU: Your Honor, objection. The witness --10 Mr. Davis is testifying for himself again. 11
- 12 THE DEFENDANT: I agree with her objection. I don't 13 know.
- THE COURT: Okay. All right. Sustained. 14
- THE DEFENDANT: I apologize. Anyway. What was I 15 16 getting at?
- Q. (By Mr. Davis) Did you happen to see what happened with my 17 wheelchair and my cane? 18
- No. I never saw a wheelchair or a cane. 19 Α.
- 20 I think the police have them anyway. No further questions. Ο.
- THE DEFENDANT: Well, wait a minute. Wait a minute. That's it. That's it. There's enough on here that's 22 No. contradicting to what's in the -- on record. 23
- THE COURT: All right. Thank you. No more 24 questions, Mr. Davis? 25

159

```
What do vou mean?
        I remember bits and pieces of what happened. I freaked out.
 3
        I lost -- I had a diminished capacity is what they call that I
 4
        quess.
 5
                  MS. ZHOU: Your Honor, I object. Can we have a
           sidebar, please.
 6
                  THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, we're going to
 7
           have a sidebar. Please talk amongst yourselves.
 8,
 9
                  THE DEFENDANT: Rum and coke, please.
             (Side-bar conference held outside hearing of jury.)
10
                  THE DEFENDANT: That was a good rum and coke. Next
11
12
           time make it a double.
                  THE COURT: Thank you for your patience, ladies and
13
14
           gentlemen. The objection is sustained.
              Mr. Jefferson, you may continue with your questions.
15
    Q. (By Mr. Jefferson) All right. Do you remember a car in the
16
17
        parking lot of the Bayview Thriftway?
    A. Yes. There were many cars in the parking lot at Bayview
18
        Thriftway.
19
        Do you remember any car in particular?
20
    Q.
21
        Well, the one that I did break the window and I -- I -- I
        brushed the stuff out, the little cubes -- the little balls of
22
23
        glass off the seat and sat down, and the man punched me in the
        head, yes.
24
```

O. Okay. Why did you -- why did you go to that car?

THE COURT: I'll sustain the objection as to narrative.

THE DEFENDANT: What's narrative?

- Q. (By Mr. Jefferson) How do your medical conditions affect you on a daily basis?
  - A. How do they affect me? Well, geez, how do I answer that one?

    They affect me every nanosecond. And there's trillions of these effects. But I'm dealing with -- okay. I'll explain it this way: Your immune system is attacking your myelin system in your brain stem, which is the communication process between your brain and everything else chemically, electrically, physically, atomically, systemically, tissually, and it's just a whole bunch of things that it picks at and destroys.
- 14 Q. Does it affect how you walk?
- 15 A. Yes, it does.
- 16 | O. How?

1.

2

3

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

- A. It affects how you move, period. It affects movement, and if
  you don't do it, you lose it. And then your body starts to
  eat itself eventually. And it's like -- I guess I call it
  rigor mortis, but you're still living.
- 21 Q. On the day of the incident were you affected by this condition?
- 22 A. I'm affected by this condition the rest of my life.
- Q. Do you remember being at a Bayview store on the day of this incident?
- 25 A. Currently, yes.

2

3

MS. ZHOU: And I think this goes back to the issue that was addressed at sidebar.

THE COURT: Sustain the objection as to the answer to the extent it's not tailored to what happened that night

- 5 Q. (By Mr. Jefferson) How you were feeling when you got to that car?
- 7 A. Scared.
- 8 Q. Why were you scared?
- 9 A. I don't know. I have not been able to grasp that concept of
  why I was scared as of yet. I've been working on it. Like I

  told you, it took me about five and a half weeks you showing
  me that video to get the bits and pieces of why I was in jail
  and why what happened happened.
- 14 Q. On that evening had you taken any drugs?
- 15 A. Yes.
- 16 Q. What drugs?
- 17 A. On that evening I had been on crystal methamphetamine and a lack of sleep.
- Q. Do you -- you stated that you have seen a video. Is that the video that was played earlier in court?
- 21 A. Yes.
- 22 Q. All right. Do you recall what happened at the car?
- 23 A. Vaguely.
- 24 O. What do you recall?
- 25 | A. I recall seeing someone that I felt that knew me and I knew

- A. Honestly, if I -- this is going to sound ridiculous, but I

  went to that car because I felt that that was an international

  agent that had been following me, and I wanted his help.
- Q. What do you mean by an international agent and you wanted his help?
  - A. Because I think I'd been losing it while I'd been on that drug. But, like, two years of being homeless, all of my avenues had been severed, and I ended up riding on the bus a lot, and there was a couple of buses out here -- basically there's surveillance vehicles. They're called RapidRides, and it's light rail. They're all -- they're all -- they have -- they're all monitored. They have wi-fi systems. They have surveillance systems that are, like, amazing. And I met a lot of Homeland Security people. Well, I could tell.
- Q. Are you mentioning this because you took a bus ride down here on that evening?
  - A. No. I mention it because these are some of the things I've been going through the last couple of years. I'm getting to a point where it's when I mention that I thought -- well, I still feel he might be, but now --
    - MS. ZHOU: Your Honor, the State's objecting to relevance.

THE DEFENDANT: Well, relevance --

THE COURT: Hold on, Mr. Davis.

THE DEFENDANT: Sorry.

25

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

17

18.

19

20

21

22

23

ρ

So obviously we have an interval here. I suggest that we give the jury an interval of time. I will leave the bench and then hope to get some further information from the bailiff as to whether our juror is able to continue or not.

So the record is clear, we had -- I think it was juror four stated -- or somehow expressed to the bailiff that she was unable to continue because she was feeling ill. She said a couple of times that as she was walking out of the courtroom that she felt like she was going to faint and she was fanning herself. At that point the jury was escorted out of the jury room and we are currently without the jury.

While we have this opportunity I do want to place on the record a sidebar. At 2:16 there was a sidebar. It was approximately two minutes in length. It was requested by the State following a statement made by Mr. Davis during his testimony about -- he used the phrase "diminished capacity" in relationship to his condition that evening.

Ms. Zhou requested the sidebar. The Court granted the sidebar.

At the sidebar Ms. Zhou stated that Mr. Davis had not stated a diminished capacity defense in his omnibus order and this was new to the State and it was too late for Mr. Davis to express a diminished capacity defense at this point. Ms. Zhou also said that she had objected to the

earlier testimony about the condition and the Court had overruled the objection. At the sidebar the State -- or rather the Court stated that it had permitted Mr. Davis some latitude to talk about his conditions; however, it was not going to permit a diminished capacity defense under the circumstances and was not going to permit testimony tieing his conditions with an excuse or an excuse for the -- akin to a diminished capacity defense in that it was not timely.

2.3

At that point the -- we left the sidebar, and in the Court's observation the questioning continued consistent with that ruling from the Court. The Court did in front of the jury on the record sustain the objection that had been placed prior to the sidebar.

Ms. Zhou, anything to add with respect to the sidebar?

Ms. ZHOU: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Davis, anything to add?

THE DEFENDANT: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. So again, I don't know how long we have here before we can adjourn. I guess what I'd like to do at this point given that we are probably close to the end of the testimony can we have a brief discussion regarding jury instructions. I --

 $\ensuremath{\mathsf{MR}}.$  JEFFERSON: We need five minutes . He needs to use the restroom.

THE COURT: Oh. Okay. All right. Well, let us

## SEPTEMBER 17, 2015

THE HONORABLE JAMES J. DIXON, PRESIDING

•

\_ \_

MS. ZHOU: We could address number 28 on the calendar, State vs. Keith Davis.

THE COURT: State vs. Keith Davis, 28. Good morning, Mr. O'Connor, standing in for Mr. Jefferson.

MR. O'CONNOR: Good morning, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Davis is not present. The Court was advised early this morning that Mr. Davis is being extremely disruptive in the jail. This Court has prior experience with Mr. Davis on numerous occasions, and on those occasions Mr. Davis has been disruptive, and the Court has advised corrections staff that Mr. Davis need not be brought up from the jail this morning for purposes of this motion.

Mr. O'Connor?

MR. O'CONNOR: Your Honor, again standing in for, as the Court knows, Mr. Jefferson this morning, who is unavailable. He is in trial this morning.

I don't know if the Court had an opportunity to review his motion and declaration for withdrawal. I don't have much to add other than what is said. The substance of it is corroborated somewhat by Mr. Davis this morning. I know the Court has personal

experience in conducting some of the prior hearings with Mr. Davis.

It appears that Mr. Jefferson has made earnest attempts to speak with Mr. Davis prior to his trial, which my understanding is to begin next week, and Mr. Davis has refused to speak with his attorney to let him know an alternative at this point.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Ms. Zhou?

MS. ZHOU: Your Honor, I will defer to the Court. I can tell the Court from what I've observed in court, I know -- I've also read Mr. Jefferson's motion. I believe there is merit to that motion.

The State doesn't have any objections to allowing Mr. Jefferson to withdraw. I can tell the Court that we had confirmed this yesterday because it was on the status calendar. My understanding is that Mr. Jefferson will still be in trial next week, so the likelihood of Mr. Davis' case going forward to trial next week is very small. The last allowable date for trial right now is September 28th. The only concern the State has is with regards to the speedy trial clock.

In addition, as far as proceeding to trial, the State is ready, but we do need a firm start date

mainly because one of our witnesses lives on the East Coast and we will have to arrange traveling accommodations for them.

THE COURT: The Court is going to deny the motion. The Court is empathetic with Mr. Jefferson, but the Court believes that the problem lies with Mr. Davis, not Mr. Jefferson. The Court also understands that there is a distinct possibility this case might not proceed to trial next week in light of the fact that Mr. Jefferson will be in trial next week.

The Court is going to deny the motion without prejudice and allow Mr. Jefferson an opportunity to come back in front of the Court with his client if that is Mr. Jefferson's request.

MR. O'CONNOR: Yes. Your Honor.

MS. ZHOU: Your Honor, the only thing I would ask is, given Mr. Davis' disruptive behavior, if Mr. Jefferson renews the motion, I would just inquire of the Court as to whether the Court is willing to hear it on a different calendar so Mr. Davis can appear via video.

THE COURT: The answer to that is yes. I appreciate the suggestion.

MS. ZHOU: Thank you, Your Honor.

(Proceedings were concluded.)

MOTION HEARING

| 1  | CERTIFICATE   |
|----|---|
| 2  | STATE OF WASHINGTON )                                     |
| 3  | ) ss<br>COUNTY OF THURSTON )                              |
| 4  | I, Cheri L. Davidson, Official Court Reporter, in         |
| 5  | and for the State of Washington, residing at Olympia, do  |
| 6  | hereby certify:   |
| 7  | That the annexed and foregoing Verbatim Report of         |
| 8  | Proceedings was reported by me and reduced to typewriting |
| 9  | by computer-aided transcription;                          |
| 10 | That said transcript is a full, true, and correct         |
| 1  | transcript of the proceedings heard before Judge James J. |
| 12 | Dixon on the 17th day of September, 2015 at Thurston      |
| 13 | County Superior Court, Olympia, Washington;               |
| 14 | That I am not a relative or employee of counsel           |
| 15 | or to either of the parties herein or otherwise           |
| 16 | interested in said proceedings.                           |
| 17 | WITNESS MY HAND THIS day of,                              |
| 18 | 2015.   |
| 19 |   |
| 20 | Official Court Reporter                                   |
| 21 |   |
| 22 |   |
| 23 |   |
| 24 |   |
| 25 | ,   |

CERTIFICATE

| 1  | 11 o'clock on Friday that we scheduled before the  |
|----|--|
| 2  | vacation.  |
| 3  | THE DEFENDANT: I actually have a motion to         |
| 4  | dismiss counsel and a declaration.                 |
| 5  | THE COURT: Mr. Davis?                              |
| 6  | THE DEFENDANT: I'm trying to get rid of him.       |
| 7  | THE COURT: Mr. Davis, I'm trying to figure         |
| 8  | out a way to hear your request. Mr. Davis?         |
| 9  | THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am.                         |
| 10 | THE COURT: I'm not going to allow any              |
| 11 | outbursts in the courtroom.                        |
| 12 | THE DEFENDANT: I understand that, ma'am, but       |
| 13 | I've been here five months and nothing has been    |
| 14 | accomplished. He's been confiscating all of my     |
| 15 | motions, and I'm just tired of it.                 |
| 16 | THE COURT: All right. M̞r. Davis, again I          |
| 17 | don't  |
| 18 | THE DEFENDANT: I apologize. I'm just not           |
| 19 | used to this. I'm from King County, not Thurston   |
| 20 | County. You know, we usually don't have these      |
| 21 | problems. I'm already pro se with two cases and no |
| 22 | access to the courts.                              |
| 23 | THE COURT: Mr. Davis, Mr. Davis                    |
| 24 | THE DEFENDANT: Two Washington State Superior       |
| 25 | Court cases. The man has done nothing for me       |

MOTION HEARING 6

MS. ZHOU: Your Honor, Mr. Jefferson has a meeting scheduled, and I can tell the Court that as of right now I'm available at 11, but it's very likely that I will not be available because I have an interview that needs to be done regarding an in-custody case. I'm just waiting to hear back from my detective.

THE COURT: How about 10:30?

MS. ZHOU: The meeting would -- the interview would actually start around 10:30. I anticipate it's going to be a lengthy interview.

I can also tell the Court with regards to Mr.

Davis -- the motion to withdraw counsel or to waive counsel -- it's been before the Court I think two times now, and both times it's been denied.

THE COURT: I know that. Mr. Davis has renewed the request after the Court addressed the competency issues, and the Court wishes to conduct an appropriate hearing.

Mr. Jefferson?

MR. JEFFERSON: Your Honor, normally I would agree to the 11 o'clock which the Court has suggested. I have a case that has gone on for a long period of time and I finally have an -- I have a client meeting set up with that particular person at

MOTION HEARING

- A. So what was the question again?
- Q. The question is being that he hit me with his right arm, and I'm over on this side, and he hit -- his wound is here on the right arm, forearm, could that have been caused by him hitting me instead of the glass? The reason I ask is because injury, okay, that's an injury, and I'm not trying to be responsible for an injury.

MS. ZHOU: Your Honor, I'm going to object.
Mr. Davis is not asking a question at this moment.

THE COURT: Well, the question was proper. I'm going to sustain the objection to the comments after the question. The jury will disregard the comments after the question, but the question's permissible.

Mr. Davis.

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: If the witness remembers the question, he can answer.

THE DEFENDANT: Okay.

- A. Yes, Your Honor. I think it's highly unlikely based on what

  Mr. Lee said. He said that he punched you with his fist. So

  he didn't use his forearm at all.
- Q. (By Mr. Davis) Okay. Okay. Okay. I just got one more question, Officer. Okay. He punched me with his fist, but does it -- does that wound actually -- was it actually examined to be glass is my question. Was that a wound from

training and experience, what do you think would have happened
to any parts of the car had the rock made contact with the
car?

A. Severely damaged.

MS. ZHOU: No further questions at this time.

THE COURT: Thank you Ms. Zhou.

Mr. Davis, cross-examination.

8

9

10

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

7

## CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. DAVIS:

- Q. Yeah. Just one question, Officer. Mr. Lee hit me with his right arm, right? Correct?
- 13 A. That's what he said.
  - Q. Okay. So I'm on the left. He hits me with a right. The wound is here. Being that he has some pretty long arms, is it possible that when he hit me in my head he could have hit my tooth or something could have cut his arm or is that actually glass?

MS. ZHOU: Objection, Your Honor. Speculation.

THE COURT: Hold on, Mr. Davis. When there's an objection, you need to stop asking the questions.

I'm going to overrule the objection.

THE DEFENDANT: Okay. I'm good.

Q. (By Mr. Davis) Was that actually glass that cut his arm or was that something else? Was it actually examined?

glass?

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

- A. According to the fire department the lacerations were in accordance with glass. It was safe to assume that it was caused as a result of the window being broken.
- Q. It's an assumption then. Is there any paperwork on that? Is there -- in the incident report that it was glass that actually cut his forearm?
- A. If Mr. Davis is referring to teeth, it was pretty obvious that those marks were not as a result of being struck with the teeth, with his tooth.
- 11 Q. I don't know. I got some sharp teeth. You should see them.

  12 They're pretty bad.
- 13 A. But it's not consistent with teeth.
- Q. Okay. But the reason I'm saying because it's going all up his forearm. It's not little cuts here and there like mostly glass does. Anyway. That's it. That's all.

THE COURT: No more questions, Mr. Davis?

THE DEFENDANT: No more questions.

THE COURT: Ms. Zhou.

20

21

18

.19

REDIRECT EXAMINATION

22 BY MS. ZHOU:

- Q. Officer Sola Del Vigo, when you made observations of Mr. Lee, did you notice any teeth marks on his forearm?
- 25 A. Negative.

```
86
    Q. Okay. And after Mr. Lee was treated by the fire -- the
1
2
        medics, did you also speak to the medics?
 3
       I did.
    Q. Okay. And what, if anything, did the medics indicate was the
        injuries consistent with?
 5
    A. Glass.
    Q. Okay. No further questions.
                  THE COURT: Thank you, Ms. Zhou.
              Mr. Davis, any further questions?
9
10
                              RECROSS-EXAMINATION
11
        BY MR. DAVIS:
12
    Q. Are there any written statements regarding this wound on his
13
        forearm as glass in your -- I don't know -- in your records or
14
15
        anything? Can you admit this as an exhibit?
16
    A. There was a report written.
17
    Q. There was a report. Okay. And it said -- it's saying --
        stating that that was glass that -- on his forearm.
18
19
    A. It was consistent with glass.
20
    Q. Consistent with glass. That's all.
21
                  THE COURT: Thank you, Mr., Davis.
22
              Ms. Zhou, anything further?
23
                  MS. ZHOU: Nothing from the State, Your Honor.
24
                  THE COURT: May this witness step down?
```

MS. ZHOU: Yes, Your Honor.

25

Ms. Zhou, my apologies. 1 We will resume when we are back. Ladies and gentlemen, 2 we'll see you in a few moments. 3 (Jury exits.) THE COURT: All right. We'll be taking a ten-minute 6 break. I expect that we will resume and be able to continue without further interruptions. Be in recess. 7 (A recess was taken.) 9 (Jury enters.) 10 THE COURT: All right. Please be seated. Welcome 11 back, ladies and gentlemen. We are continuing with the 12 13 State's closing argument. You may proceed, Ms. Zhou. 14 MS. ZHOU: Thank you, Your Honor. 15 THE DEFENDANT: Your Honor, I would like to declare 16 a mistrial at this time on the grounds that --17 THE COURT: Hold on. Ladies and gentlemen, please 18 talk amongst yourselves. We're going to have a sidebar. 19 20 (Side-bar.conference held outside hearing of jury.) THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, we are going to 21 22 have you leave the courtroom briefly. 23 (Jury exits.) 24 THE COURT: All right. So we had a sidebar. It was about 15 seconds in length. The Court requested the 25

sidebar after Mr. Davis requested a mistrial. The Court asked for the sidebar to try to understand what the basis of the request was. When Mr. Davis at the sidebar began — and to be honest, I cut him off halfway through his sentence. But he began with a reference to how long he has been requesting to go pro se, and at that point the Court determined that the best way to deal with the request was to excuse the jury and have the entire discussion on the record.

Я

So Mr. Davis, the floor is yours. What is your request for a mistrial?

THE DEFENDANT: Okay, Your Honor. Basically I have had no time to prepare for this case. In regards to Mr. Jefferson, I understand he is a public defender and he has a lot of clients at any given time, 60, 70 clients a week, what have you, and he doesn't really have time to deal with cases with a lot of time, you know, put a lot of time in cases. Being that I was only -- I was allowed prose the day of trial, it's truly a disadvantage. I'm already at a disadvantage, but this is really a disadvantage. I've had no time to research or do nothing.

On top of all of that, I've been harassed at the jail due to my condition as sport and play and amusement with a certain group of officers, was assaulted. They're not dealing with my medical issues.

Just besides all that, the main reason for the mistrial is I've been asking to exercise my constitutional right to represent myself in this matter for six months, and this isn't the first time that this maneuver has been pulled on me with Washington State Superior Court system. So I know it's a ploy, and it's to discourage people to have their chance to prove their innocence because it's not prove that you're guilty beyond a reasonable doubt; it's you've got to prove your innocence, and that's the whole reality of it.

And I mean, I really don't want to go to battle with Washington State prosecution because those guys are good.

But I'm being charged with an outrageous crime because I have nine prior points which are nonviolent, by the way, and it just doesn't sit right with me. This is an odd and ugly situational case, but she's going out of her way where I need to really go and research and be really prepared for this because she's taking assault one through five and putting them all together as -- well, if he's still on the ground, you have to find him guilty, things of that. She's using a lot of trickery that I'm not ready for or know how to prepare for.

This particular county jail, their pro se workstation is not really even a workstation. And it's like you got one hour. There is no set time or none of that so there's no books available. There's nothing. There's a few things

there, but I mean, I'm just saying. I have not had any time to prepare. I've asked and requested for my constitutional right several times, and the United States

THE COURT: Two minutes.

THE DEFENDANT: Okay. Thank you. The United States Supreme Court says you've got to let me do it if I ask to. So if I exercise — ask to exercise my constitutional right, I can't be denied, but I have been. And that's basically my argument for a mistrial. I'm not prepared for — to go to trial. What is it? This is the third day and have had no access to any resources or time.

THE COURT: Ms. Zhou, your response.

MS. ZHOU: Your Honor, I believe the Court already did its colloquy with Mr. Davis on the first day of trial. He still chose to go *pro se* so I think the issue has been addressed.

THE COURT: All right. So Mr. Davis, you have argued here today for a mistrial because you are not prepared to -- as you say, not prepared. At the outset of this trial I had a lengthy colloquy with you.

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, you did.

THE COURT: And in that lengthy colloquy I took a lot of time to talk with you about the disadvantages of representing yourself. Among those disadvantages were your

the fact you weren't familiar with the evidence rules, the fact you weren't familiar with the protocols. In addition to that you said I believe I'm a smart gentleman and I can learn this, and I can learn how to do this, and I said to you, Mr. Davis, I said to you this trial is -- you don't have time to learn this. This trial, you don't have time, and because of that you had a counsel who had confirmed that this was ready for trial, who was ready to go, and I pleaded with you to have Mr. Jefferson represent you in this case.

THE DEFENDANT: He's not ready.

THE COURT: Don't --

THE DEFENDANT: I'm sorry.

THE COURT: I pleaded with you to not represent yourself. I pleaded with you in part, in large part, because you are not prepared to do this trial. You are not capable of understanding the evidence rules. You don't understand how to go about doing this.

Now, I also explained to you that the case law of this state says regardless of your inability to technically understand what's going on here you have the right to move forward without a lawyer. I repeatedly, not at the beginning, not only at the beginning, but throughout the first day and in the second day pleaded with you to have Mr. Jefferson represent you, and we are now halfway through

or perhaps even further than that through the State's closing arguments, and you've asked for a mistrial because of all of the things I explained to you on the first day, and you've nevertheless made the decision to move forward on your own.

This court has been, in my view, exceedingly patient with you and your representation of yourself. I have at every step endeavored to protect you and your constitutional rights to represent yourself in this trial, and yet you ask for a mistrial halfway through or three-quarters of the way through the State's closing argument. I am denying your request for a mistrial. I am permitting you at this time to have Mr. Jefferson represent you in your closing arguments. I have not asked the State's perspective on that. I don't know if the State has an objection to that, but that --

Is there an objection, Ms. Zhou?

MS. ZHOU: No, Your Honor. I think it's -- as the Court indicated, it was a hybrid.

THE COURT: Mr. Jefferson has been with you at your side every step of the way. Now, to the extent that Mr. Jefferson's ability to represent you in your closing is compromised by his inability to be your counsel throughout this trial, that is certainly something this court understands as well as any appellate court looking at this

-7

needs to understand, but at this point your decisions this:

To move forward with you doing your closing argument or to

move forward with Mr. Jefferson doing your closing

argument, but this trial is continuing. What is your

decision?

THE DEFENDANT: I'm going to continue, but there is case law, Your Honor, that says you have to allow me appropriate time.

THE COURT: Mr. Davis, I have given you a lot of leeway throughout this trial, extra time to prepare your own testimony, extra time to -- an entire evening to plan your closing. Your time has been provided to you. In addition to that, the lack of time from the outset of this trial was explained to you by me, and you insisted to represent yourself. I again plead with you to have Mr. Jefferson do your closing argument for you. I am asking you again, as I've asked you multiple times throughout this trial, please have Mr. Jefferson do your closing argument.

THE DEFENDANT: One question. How come my public defender gets six months and I get three days to represent myself? He's a lawyer with the bar, and I'm a pro se litigant, but I get three days and he gets six months. She gets six, seven months or whatever it's been, six months to prepare. She's the prosecutor. He gets six months to

prepare. He's a lawyer. But I get three days to prepare, and I'm a pro se litigant. How does that -- how does that compute? What's the math on that? I don't --

THE COURT: Mr. Davis, there was no request for a continuance made at the outset of this trial when I explained to you the difficulties that you would have in representing yourself. I am -- I have made my decision. You have a decision -- Mr. Davis. You have now a decision. Do you move forward with you doing your closing argument that will be consistent with the rules of evidence, or would you finally agree to have Mr. Jefferson represent you for the purposes of your closing argument?

THE DEFENDANT: I'm going to move forward.

THE COURT: All right. I expect that we will move forward without further interruptions or delays apart from legitimate objections, and we will continue with this case. Let's bring the jury back in.

Ms. Zhou, when the jury's in, you may continue with your closing.

MS. ZHOU: Yes, Your Honor. Thank you.

THE COURT: Mr. Jefferson, did you want to be heard?

MR. JEFFERSON: No, Your Honor. Thank you, Your Honor.

(Jury enters.)

THE COURT: All right . Please be seated.

13

14

15

12

9

10

11

16 17

> 18 19

20

21

22

23

24 25

Keith A. Davis#216001169 King County Jail 500 Fifth Avenue avicl C. Ponzoha, Clerk

ashing ton State Court Of Appeals

APR 19 2018

Division I I

STATE-OF WASHINGTON 750 Broadway, Suite 300 Tacoma, WA 98402 RE: Case# 48183-9-II / State Of Washington, Respondent vs. Keit Adair Davis Appellant. Mr. Ponzoha, Enclosed Is My Statement Of Additional Grounds
For Review. I Am Currently Housed, Residing In
The King County Jail. I Am Indigent. I Am
Unable To Pay For Copies. I Only Receive, Three
Pieces Of Paper A Week. Had To Sell Food, From Teal Trays For Paper

|             | I Request, That The Court Will Accept My  |
|-------------|---|
|             | I Request, That The Court Will Accept My<br>S.A.G., And Duplicate Necessary Copies<br>For Attorney's And Myself. Thank You. |
|             |   |
|             | Please Apprise Me Of Your Decision.   |
|             |   |
| <u> </u>    |   |
|             |   |
|             | Keith A. Davis#216001169 Respectfully,<br>King County Jail<br>500 Fifth Avenue /A/)—<br>Seattle, WA 98104 Keith A. Davis    |
|             | King County Jail  |
| <del></del> | 500 Fifth Avenue  |
|             | Seattle, WA 98109 Neith A. Davis  |
|             |   |
|             |   |
|             |   |
|             |   |
|             |   |
|             |   |
|             |   |
|             |   |
|             |   |

-2-